

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LISA LIBERI, et al.,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 09-1898
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ORLY TAITZ, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

AMENDED ORDER

AND NOW, this **22nd** day of **June, 2010**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Court Order, dated June 3, 2010, is **AMENDED** as follows. On June 25, 2009, the Court issued a rule to show cause upon Plaintiff as to why this case should not be (1) dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction; (2) severed into three or fewer cases against the following groups or Defendants: (i) the Hales; (ii) Belcher; (iii) Taitz, DOFF, and Sankey; and (3) transferred to an appropriate district in either Texas or California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).¹ See Court Order, doc. no. 80.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' responses to the rule to show cause, Defendants'

¹ On June 25, 2009, the Court issued an order that no further motions shall be filled without prior leave of the Court. See Court Order, doc. no. 78. No motions granted leave to file are currently pending.

replies thereto and Plaintiff Berg's motion for reconsideration, the Court will now **SEVER** the instant case into two separate, independent actions and **TRANSFER** each action to the jurisdiction of the following district courts. All claims pending against Defendants Linda Sue Belcher, Edgar Hale, Caren Hale, Plains Radio Network, Bar H. Farms, and KPRN A.M. 1610 are transferred to the Western District Court of Texas. All claims pending against Defendants Orly Taitz, Defend Our Freedoms Foundations, Neil Sankey, The Sankey Firm and Sankey Investigations, Inc. are transferred to the Southern Division of the Central District of California.²

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case shall be marked **CLOSED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Eduardo C. Robreno

EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

² All requests for leave to file pleadings submitted during the time the case was in suspense from December 9, 2009 to June 4, 2010, of which only one letter was made part of the docket (see Berg Letter in Opp'n to Def. Taitz, dated Jan. 10, 2010, doc. no. 116), are denied as moot.